Michael W. Sewright **BURR, PEASE & KURTZ** 810 N Street Anchorage, AK 99501-3293

Telephone: (907) 276-6100

Fax No.:

(907) 258-2530

Attorneys for North Star

NO DOCKET DATE \_\_\_

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA AT ANCHORAGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of NORTH STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & Handling, and NORTH STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & Handling, on its own behalf,

Plaintiffs,

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, and SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, on its own behalf.

Intervening Plaintiffs,

and

METCO, INC.,

Intervening Plaintiff,

VS.

NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.; SPENCER ROCK PRODUCTS, INC.; UNITED STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTY COMPANY; and ROBERT A. LAPORE,

Defendants.

Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH)

**NORTH STAR'S** SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY **REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT UNITED STATES** FIDELITY & GUARANTY **COMPANY** 

**3URR, PEASE** & KURTZ OFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET ICHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT USF&G

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 1 of 9

45-40/#82045

Exhibit

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, 33 and 34, Plaintiff/Use - Plaintiff North Star Terminal and Stevedore Company (hereinafter "North Star") propounds the following discovery requests to United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, the above-named defendant in this action, to be answered in writing within thirty (30) days of service in accordance with the above-referenced rules.

Any reference in these discovery requests to "you", "your", or "yourself" refers to the above-named defendant in this lawsuit including each of its agents, representatives and attorneys, and each person acting or purporting to act on the behalf of that defendant.

As used herein, the words "document" and "documents," or the reference to any type of document or documents, shall mean the original and any copy, regardless of origin or location, of any book, pamphlet, periodical, letter, memorandum, telegram, facsimile, email, report, record, study, handwritten note, map, drawing, working paper, chart paper, graph, index, tape, daily sheet, diary, data or processing card, computer-stored record, business record, financial record, accounting record, correspondence, or any other written, recorded, transcribed, punched, taped, electronically stored, filmed, photographed or graphic matter, however produced or reproduced, to which you have or have had access to.

BURR. PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT USF&G
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 2 of 9
45-40/#82045

As used herein, the term "representative" means any and all agents, employees, servants, officers, directors, attorneys, or other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of the person in question including the above-named defendant.

As used herein, the term "person" means any natural individual in any capacity whatsoever or any entity or organization, including divisions, departments, and other units therein, and shall include, but not be limited to, a public or private corporation, company, partnership, joint venture, voluntary or unincorporated association, organization, proprietorship, other business, trust estate, governmental agency, commission, bureau or department.

As used herein, the terms "identification", "identify", or "identity", when used in reference to:

- (a) A natural individual: requires you to state his or her full name and residential and business addresses and telephone numbers;
- (b) A corporation, company, or other business, entity or organization: requires you to state its full name and any names under which it does business, its state of formation, the address of its principal place of business, the addresses of all of its offices in Alaska, the identity of the person or persons who own, operate and/or control it, and its telephone numbers;

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION BIO N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT USF&G
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 3 of 9

(c) A document or thing: requires you to specifically and sufficiently describe each such item so that it may be located and/or inspected in order to confirm the existence of the item described.

The provisions of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, 33 and 34 apply in all respects to these discovery requests.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: State the date on which United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors first became a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

# **ANSWER:**

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: State all other times, by date that United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors has been a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including client and court case name and court case number if any.

BURR. PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT USF&G
United States ex rel. North Star. et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 4 of 9
45-40/#82045

Exhibit / of 9

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: State the date on which United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors was first used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that name or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: State all other times, by date, that United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors has been used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including client and court case name and court case number if any.

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 610 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT USF&G
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 5 of 9
45-40/#82045

Exhibit /
S of 9\_

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Describe in full detail each factual basis which supports, or tends to support, the allegations in each of the affirmative defenses stated in your Answer and Affirmative Defenses dated September 21, 2005 to North Star's Amended Complaint.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Completely describe the subject and contents of the information relevant to this case held by each person listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

ANSWER:

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 610 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT USF&G
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 6 of 9

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Specifically state the subject matter and content of the anticipated testimony of each witness listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

ANSWER:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Produce any and all unprivileged documents reflecting or otherwise relating to the information requested by Interrogatory Nos. 6 through 12 propounded above.

**ANSWER**:

DATED: February 14, 2006.

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ Attorneys for North Star

By

Aichael W. Sewrigh

Alaska Bar # 7510090

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
610 N STREET
NCHORAGE, AK 99501
(907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS

TO DEFENDANT USF&G

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 7 of 9

# **OATH**

United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, does hereby swear, under oath, that the foregoing answers to discovery requests are true to the best of its knowledge and belief.

UNITED STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTY COMPANY

	By:	_(signature)	
	Printed Name:	_	
	Its:	(title)	
SUBSCRIBED AND SV	WORN to before me this day of	<del>,</del>	
	NOTARY PUBLIC FOR		
	My commission expires:		

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 610 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100 2006.

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT USF&G
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 8 of 9

45-40/#82045

### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on the  $14^{th}$  day of February 2006, a copy of the foregoing was served by U.S. Mail on:

Traeger Machetanz, Esq. Thomas Krider, Esq. **OLES MORRISON & RINKER** 745 W. 4th Ave., Suite 502 Anchorage, AK 99501

Steven J. Shamburek, Esq. 425 G Street, Suite 630 Anchorage, AK 99501-5872

C. Patrick Stoll, Esq. HERRIG VOGT & STOLL LLP 4210 Douglas Blvd., Ste. 100 Granite Bay, CA 95746-5902

Paul D. Stockler, Esq. 1309 W. 16th Ave Anchorage, AK 99501

Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq. Barokas Martin & Tomlinson 1029 W. 3rd Ave., Suite 280 Anchorage, AK 99501

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ ROFESSIONAL CORPORATION BIO N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT USF&G United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 9 of 9

Exhibit \_

Michael W. Sewright BURR, PEASE & KURTZ 810 N Street Anchorage, AK 99501-3293 Telephone: (907) 276-6100

(907) 258-2530 Fax No.: Attorneys for North Star

NO DOCKET DATE DOCKETED/A

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA AT ANCHORAGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of NORTH STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & Handling, and NORTH STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & Handling, on its own behalf,

Plaintiffs,

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, and SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, on its own behalf.

Intervening Plaintiffs,

and

METCO, INC.,

Intervening Plaintiff,

VS.

NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.; SPENCER ROCK PRODUCTS, INC.; UNITED STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTY COMPANY; and ROBERT A. LAPORE,

Defendants.

Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH)

**NORTH STAR'S** SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY **REOUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET** CONSTRUCTION, INC.

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ ROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 1 of 11

45-40/#82043

Exhibit 2

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, 33 and 34, Plaintiff/Use – Plaintiff North Star Terminal and Stevedore Company (hereinafter "North Star") propounds the following discovery requests to Nugget Construction, Inc., the abovenamed defendant in this action, to be answered in writing within thirty (30) days of service in accordance with the above-referenced rules.

Any reference in these discovery requests to "you", "your", or "yourself" refers to the above-named defendant in this lawsuit including each of its agents, representatives and attorneys, and each person acting or purporting to act on the behalf of that defendant.

As used herein, the words "document" and "documents," or the reference to any type of document or documents, shall mean the original and any copy, regardless of origin or location, of any book, pamphlet, periodical, letter, memorandum, telegram, facsimile, email, report, record, study, handwritten note, map, drawing, working paper, chart paper, graph, index, tape, daily sheet, diary, data or processing card, computer-stored record, business record, financial record, accounting record, correspondence, or any other written, recorded, transcribed, punched, taped, electronically stored, filmed, photographed or graphic matter, however produced or reproduced, to which you have or have had access to.

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 2 of 11

As used herein, the term "representative" means any and all agents, employees, servants, officers, directors, attorneys, or other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of the person in question including the above-named defendant.

As used herein, the term "person" means any natural individual in any capacity whatsoever or any entity or organization, including divisions, departments, and other units therein, and shall include, but not be limited to, a public or private corporation, company, partnership, joint venture, voluntary or unincorporated association, organization, proprietorship, other business, trust estate, governmental agency, commission, bureau or department.

As used herein, the terms "identification", "identify", or "identity", when used in reference to:

- (a) A natural individual: requires you to state his or her full name and residential and business addresses and telephone numbers;
- (b) A corporation, company, or other business, entity or organization: requires you to state its full name and any names under which it does business, its state of formation, the address of its principal place of business, the addresses of all of its offices in Alaska, the identity of the person or persons who own, operate and/or control it, and its telephone numbers;

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION BIO N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 3 of 11

45-40/#82043

Exhibit <u>2</u>

3 of //\_

(c) A document or thing: requires you to specifically and sufficiently describe each such item so that it may be located and/or inspected in order to confirm the existence of the item described.

The provisions of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, 33 and 34 apply in all respects to these discovery requests.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: State the first date on which L. D. "Randy"
Randolph or LDR Engineering Services first became a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker
& Baker law firm, by that name or any other name, and state the name and nature of that
representation including the court case name and court case number if any.

# **ANSWER:**

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: State all other times, by date, Randy Randolph or LDR Engineering Services has been a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including the court case name and court case number if any.

#### ANSWER:

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ -PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 610 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 4 of 11

45-40/#82043

Exhibit 2 4 of // INTERROGATORY NO. 8: State the date on which L. D. "Randy"
Randolph or LDR Engineering Services was first used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that name or any other name, or any of its clients in any matter and state the name and nature of that representation, including the court case name and court case number if any.

**ANSWER:** 

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: State all other times, by date, Randy Randolph or LDR Engineering Services has been used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, or any of its clients in any matter and state the name and nature of each of those representations, including the court case name and court case number if any.

ANSWER:

BURR. PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL COMPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE. AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS

TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 5 of 11

45-40/#82043

Exhibit 2 5 of 11

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: State the date on which Nugget

Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors first became a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: State all other times, by date, Nugget

Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors has been a client of
the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the
name and nature of each of those representations including client and court case name and
court case number if any.

ANSWER:

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE. AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 6 of 11

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: State the date on which Nugget

Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors was first used or

designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law

firm, by that name or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature

of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: State all other times, by date, Nugget

Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors has been used or

designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law

firm, by that or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature of each

of those representations including client and court case name and court case number if

any.

**ANSWER:** 

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ
PROFESSIONAL COAPORATION
BIO N STREET
NCHORAGE, AK 99501
(907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.
United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 7 of 11

45-40/#82043

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Describe in full detail each factual basis which supports, or tends to support, the allegations in each of the affirmative defenses stated in your Answer and Affirmative Defenses dated September 21, 2005 to North Star's Amended Complaint.

ANSWER:

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Completely describe the subject and contents of the information relevant to this case held by each person listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

ANSWER:

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS
TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

\*\*United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 8 of 11

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: Specifically state the subject matter and content of the anticipated testimony of each witness listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

ANSWER:

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Produce any and all unprivileged documents reflecting or otherwise relating to the information requested by Interrogatory Nos. 6 through 16 propounded above.

ANSWER:

DATED: February 14, 2006.

**BURR, PEASE & KURTZ** Attorneys for North Star

Alaska Bar # 7510090

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ OFESSIONAL CORPORATION 8:0 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 9 of 11

2006.

NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

# **OATH**

Nugget Construction, Inc., does hereby swear, under oath, that the foregoing answers to discovery requests are true to the best of its knowledge and belief.

> By: (signature) Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_ (title) SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, NOTARY PUBLIC FOR \_\_\_\_\_ My commission expires:

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ OFESSIONAL CORPORATION 810 N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. -United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 10 of 11

45-40/#82043

Exhibit  $\mathcal{L}$ 

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on the 14th day of February 2006, a copy of the foregoing was served by U.S. Mail on:

Traeger Machetanz, Esq. Thomas Krider, Esq. OLES MORRISON & RINKER 745 W. 4th Ave., Suite 502 Anchorage, AK 99501

Steven J. Shamburek, Esq. 425 G Street, Suite 630 Anchorage, AK 99501-5872

C. Patrick Stoll, Esq. HERRIG VOGT & STOLL LLP 4210 Douglas Blvd., Ste. 100 Granite Bay, CA 95746-5902

Paul D. Stockler, Esq. 1309 W. 16th Ave Anchorage, AK 99501

Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq. Barokas Martin & Tomlinson 1029 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Suite 280 Anchorage, AK 99501

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ DIESSIONAL CORPORATION BIO N STREET NCHORAGE, AK 99501 (907) 276-6100

NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. -United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page !1 of 11

45-40/#82043

Exhibit 2 

Exhibit  $\checkmark$ / of

dase 3:98-cv-00009-TMB Document 495-2

4

11

12

8

15

22

20

26

Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq. **BAROKAS MARTIN & TOMLINSON** 1029 West Third, Suite 280 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: 907-276-8010 Fax: 907-276-5334 Counsel for USF&G

COME NOW the Defendant, United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company, herein (hereinafter "USF&G"), by and through their undersigned counsel, Barokas Martin & Tomlinson, and herein responds to Plaintiff, North Star Terminal & Stevedore Company, (hereinafter "North Star"), Second Set of Discovery Requests as follows:

#### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

- Α. Responding Party objects to the extent that any Discovery Request seeks discovery of documents or information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other recognized legal privilege.
- B. Responding Party objects to the extent that any Discovery Request (i) seeks information not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence, (ii) is over broad or unduly burdensome, and/or (iii) is vague or ambiguous.
- Responding Party objects to the extent that any Discovery Request calls for C. information that may reasonably be derived or ascertained from the parties' business records (as produced in discovery) or from an examination, audit or inspection of those records.
- D. Responding Party objects to the extent that any Discovery Request, or its accompanying instructions, call for information or details beyond what is required under the Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure.
- Responding Party objects to the extent that any Discovery Request seeks E. information within North Star's own possession or control.
- F. Responding Party objects to these Discovery Requests to the extent that they call for a level of detail beyond the reasonable scope of Discovery and which is more appropriate for discovery by depositions.

**BAROKAS MARTIN & TOMLINSON** 1029 West Third, Suite 280 Anchorage, AK 99501

Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq.

1 3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

Phone: 907-276-8010 Fax: 907-276-5334 Counsel for USF&G

> G. The following Responses to North Star's Discovery Requests are made subject to the foregoing objections which are incorporated into each and every answer.

## RESPONSES TO REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION AND INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: State the date on which United States Fidelity and guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors first became a client of Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case name and court case number if any.

RESPONSE: Documents responsive to this Discovery Request have previously been produced. The date the firm entered an appearance would be the date that the formal representation began as regards the instant litigation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: State all other times, by date the United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors have been a client of Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of each of their representations including client and court case name and court case number if any.

This Interrogatory is much too broad and unduly burdensome to RESPONSE: respond to as Defendant has no idea if any employee's, officers, or former directors have ever been clients of the firm. The firm may have previously provided representation to Answering Defendant with regard to bond claims. The claims are made under the name of the principal and it is extremely difficult to determine particular firms representing Answering Defendant on any specific occasions. Answering Defendant is conducting a search of its records in an attempt tempt to more fully respond to this Interrogatory.

3 Phone: 907-276-8010 Fax: 907-276-5334 Counsel for USF&G

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: State the date on which United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors was first used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

RESPONSE: Answering Defendant does not provide consultation or expert witness services and, therefore, has never been employed by said firm in that capacity. Answering Defendant cannot possibly know if any employees, officers or former directors served as an expert witness or consultant for said firm in their individual capacity outside their employment with Answering Defendant.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: State all other times, by date, that United States Fidelity and Guaranty Company or any of the St. Paul Insurance Companies and/or any of their employees, officers or directors has been used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including client and curt case name and court case number if any.

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory No. 8.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Describe in full detail each factual basis which supports, or tends to support, the allegations in each of the affirmative defenses stated in your Answer and Affirmative Defenses dated September 21, 2005 to North Star's Amended Complaint.

RESPONSE: See Response of Defendant, Nugget Construction, Inc., to a similar Discovery Request as Answering Defendant was also being represented by Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker on the date the Affirmative Defenses were forwarded on behalf of both

Counsel for USF&G

Defendants. The only independent claim forwarded by Defendants against Answering Defendants is one based on bad faith. There exists absolutely no evidence of any bad faith of Answering Defendant. Answering Defendant has no obligation to settle the litigation independent from its principal, and chose not to do so. This is not bad faith. There exists no intelligible articulated claim for bad faith against Answering Defendant outside this specific allegation. The matter will be addressed in a Summary Judgment Motion, as will the Amended Affirmative Defense of Statute of Limitations forwarded by the undersigned, as the Statute of Limitations expired on the claims asserted by Plaintiff against Defendant long before Plaintiff's Amended Complaints dated August 31, 2005. INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Completely describe the subject and contents of the information relevant to this case held by each person listed on your final witness list due

RESPONSE: See Response to Interrogatory No. 12.

February 14, 2006, herein.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Specifically state the subject matter and content of the anticipated testimony of each witness listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

RESPONSE: See General Objections. This Discovery Request calls for a level of detail beyond the reasonable scope of Discovery and which is more appropriate for Discovery by depositions. This Discovery Request calls for information or details which is beyond what is required under the Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Produce any and all unprivileged documents reflecting or otherwise relating to the information requested by Interrogatory No. 6 through 12 propounded above.

BAROKAS MARTIN & TOMLINSON

M447:10: 2006 1:29PM

Exhibit

Case 3:98-cv-00009-TMB Document 495-2 Filed 05/01/2006 Page 27 of 50

13 14 15 16 17 18 (a) 99501-2136 Fax: (907) 258-5519 19 745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502 20 21 22 Anchorage, Ala (907) 258-0106 23 24 Te.: 25

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

Traeger Machetanz, Esq. Thomas R. Krider, Esq. OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP 745 Fourth Avenue, Suite 502 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 Telephone: 907-258-0106 Facsimile: 907-277-8001

Attorneys for Defendant Nugget Construction, Inc.

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA AT ANCHORAGE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of NORTH STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & Handling, and NORTH STAR TERMINAL & STEVEDORE COMPANY, d/b/a Northern Stevedoring & Handling, on its own behalf.

Plaintiffs.

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA for the use of SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, and SHORESIDE PETROLEUM, INC., d/b/a Marathon Fuel Service, on its own behalf,

Intervening Plaintiffs,

and

METCO, INC.,

Intervening Plaintiff,

VS.

NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.; SPENCER ROCK PRODUCTS, INC.; UNITED STATES FIDELITY AND GUARANTY COMPANY; and ROBERT A. LAPORE,

Defendants.

Case No. A98-009 CIV (HRH)

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 1 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

45-40/#82043

ORIGINAL

Fax: (907) 258-5519

(907) 258-0106

Tel:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, 33 and 34, Plaintiff/Use -Plaintiff North Star Terminal and Stevedore Company (hereinafter "North Star") propounds the following discovery requests to Nugget Construction, Inc., the above-named defendant in this action, to be answered in writing within thirty (30) days of service in accordance with the above-referenced rules.

Any reference in these discovery requests to "you", "your", or "yourself" refers to the above-named defendant in this lawsuit including each of its agents, representatives and attorneys, and each person acting or purporting to act on the behalf of that defendant.

As used herein, the words "document" and "documents," or the reference to any type of document or documents, shall mean the original and any copy, regardless of origin or location, of any book, pamphlet, periodical, letter, memorandum, telegram, facsimile, email, report, record, study, handwritten note, map, drawing, working paper, chart paper, graph, index, tape, daily sheet, diary, data or processing card, computer-stored record, business record, financial record, accounting record, correspondence, or any other NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) 45-40/#82043 Page 2 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit <u>4</u>
2 of <u>/7</u>

written, recorded, transcribed, punched, taped, electronically stored, filmed, photographed or graphic matter, however produced or reproduced, to which you have or have had access to.

As used herein, the term "representative" means any and all agents, employees, servants, officers, directors, attorneys, or other persons acting or purporting to act on behalf of the person in question including the above-named defendant.

As used herein, the term "person" means any natural individual in any capacity whatsoever or any entity or organization, including divisions, departments, and other units therein, and shall include, but not be limited to, a public or private corporation, company, partnership, joint venture, voluntary or unincorporated association, organization, proprietorship, other business, trust estate, governmental agency, commission, bureau or department.

As used herein, the terms "identification", "identify", or "identity", when used in reference to:

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY
REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 3 of 17

P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit 4
3 of 17

		14
		15
		16
		17
Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136		18
	6155	19
	7) 258-	20
	x: (90)	21
	5 Fa	22
rage, A	58-010x	23
Ancho	.907) 2:	24
	Tel: (	25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

- (a) A natural individual: requires you to state his or her full name and residential and business addresses and telephone numbers;
- (b) A corporation, company, or other business, entity or organization: requires you to state its full name and any names under which it does business, its state of formation, the address of its principal place of business, the addresses of all of its offices in Alaska, the identity of the person or persons who own, operate and/or control it, and its telephone numbers;
- (c) A document or thing: requires you to specifically and sufficiently describe each such item so that it may be located and/or inspected in order to confirm the existence of the item described.

The provisions of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26, 33 and 34 apply in all respects to these discovery requests.

#### GENERAL OBJECTIONS

- 1. Defendant objects to the form of Plaintiff's pleading insofar as it imposes duties beyond those required under Rules 33 and 34.
- 2. Defendant objects to all instructions and definitions to the extent they enlarge upon, supersede, or in any way modify the rules of discovery as set forth in CR 26, CR 33 and CR 34.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget C

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 4 of 17
P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

45-40/#82043

Exhibit 4 of 7

Fax: (907) 258-5519

Tel:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3.	De	efend	ant	obje	ects	to	P.	lain	tif:	f's	reque	sts	for
product													
inadmis	sible	e and	l are	not	releva	ant	to	the	sub	ject	matte	r of	this
action,	or	are	no	t re	asonab	oly	cal	cula	ated	l to	lead	to	the
discove	ery of	f adm	issik	ole ev	ridenc	e.					•		

- Defendant objects to Plaintiff's interrogatories and requests for production of documents to the extent that they impose an undue burden on the responding party.
- Defendant objects to Plaintiff's interrogatories and requests for production of documents to the extent that they information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine.
- Plaintiff's interrogatories Defendant objects to insofar as they are directed to knowledge of persons or entities not subject to control of the responding party at the time when these answers were prepared.
- Defendants object to Plaintiff's discovery requests to the extent they seek information not pertinent to the present litigation involving the breach of the parties' settlement agreement.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: State the first date on which L.

D. "Randy" Randolph or LDR Engineering Services first became a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that name or any other name, and state the name and nature of that representation including the court case name and court case number if any.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) 45-40/#82043 Page 5 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

# OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP 745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136 (907) 258-0106 Fax: (907) 258-5

#### ANSWER:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I. 25

Fax: (907) 258-5519

Defendant Nugget incorporates herein its General Objections addition, In Nugget objects to stated above. Interrogatory, as it is directed at entities that are neither a party to this litigation nor legally affiliated with Nugget. Further, this Interrogatory is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry directly of Mr. Randolph during his second deposition.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: State all other times, by date, Randy Randolph or LDR Engineering Services has been a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including the court case name and court case number if any.

#### ANSWER:

General Objections incorporates herein its Defendant Nugget objects In addition, Nugget stated above. Interrogatory, as it is directed at entities that are neither a party to this litigation nor legally affiliated with Nugget. Further, this Interrogatory is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry directly of Mr. Randolph during his second deposition.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: State the date on which L. D. "Randy" Randolph or LDR Engineering Services was first used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that name or any other name, or any of its clients in any matter and state the name and NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) 45-40/#82043 Page 6 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit 4

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

24

25

Ē

nature of that representation, including the court case name and court case number if any.

#### ANSWER:

incorporates herein its General Objections. Defendant Nugget objects In addition, Nugget to stated above. Interrogatory, as it is directed at entities that are neither a party to this litigation nor legally affiliated with Nugget. Further, this Interrogatory is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry directly of Mr. Randolph during his second deposition.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: State all other times, by date, Randy Randolph or LDR Engineering Services has been used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, or any of its clients in any matter and state the name and nature of each of those representations, including the court case name and court case number if any.

#### ANSWER:

General Objections Defendant Nugget incorporates herein its addition, Nugget objects above. In Interrogatory, as it is directed at entities that are neither a party to this litigation nor legally affiliated with Nugget. Further, this Interrogatory is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry directly of Mr. Randolph during his second deposition.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) 45-40/#82043 Page 7 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Fax: (907) 258-5519

Tel:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: State the date on which Nugget Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors first became a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

#### ANSWER:

incorporates herein its General Objections Defendant Nugget above. Ιn addition, Nugget objects for attorney-client Interrogatory, calls privileged it as information, and is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry during its multiple 30(b)(6) depositions of Nugget. Without waiving any of its objections, Nugget refers Plaintiff to the deposition testimony for the response to this inquiry, and provides the following information:

The first time Nugget retained Oles Morrison was in 1996 and related to the bid protest that was filed by another bidder on the project that is at issue in the present litigation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: State all other times, by date, Nugget Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors has been a client of the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including client and court case name and court case number if any.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO-DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) 45-40/#82043 Page 8 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit

1

# 2

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP 745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136 Tel: (907) 258-0106 Fax: (907) 258-5519 23 24 25

#### ANSWER:

incorporates herein its General Objections Defendant Nugget objects to above. In addition, Nugget privileged calls for attorney-client Interrogatory, as it information, and is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry during its multiple 30(b)(6) depositions of Nugget. Without waiving any of its objections, Nugget refers Plaintiff to the deposition testimony for the response to this inquiry, and provides the following information:

The first time Nugget retained Oles Morrison was in 1996 and related to the bid protest that was filed by another bidder on the project that is at issue in the present litigation.

Oles Morrison represented Nugget in the Alaska State Court case in which Nugget brought suit against Spencer Rock Products to recover its damages on the project that is at issue in the present litigation. Case No. 3AN-97-9509 Civil.

Oles Morrison represented Nugget before the Armed Services Board of Contract Appeal (Appeal of Nugget Construction, Inc., under Contract No. DACA85-99-C-0017) with regard to a termination for convenience claim on a project for the Army on St. Lawrence Island, AK.

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: State the date on which Nugget Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors was first used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that name or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature of that representation including client and court case name and court case number if any.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO-DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 9 of 17 45-40/#82043 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136 (907) 258-0106 Fax: (907) 258-5519 19

20

21 22

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP 745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502

23

24

Tcl: 25 ANSWER:

General Objections incorporates herein its Defendant Nugget objects to Nugget above. Ιn addition. privileged attorney-client it. calls for Interrogatory, as information, and is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry during its multiple 30(b)(6) depositions of Nugget. Without waiving any of its objections, Nugget refers Plaintiff. to the deposition testimony for the response to this inquiry.

State all other times, by date, INTERROGATORY NO. 13: Nugget Construction, Inc. and/or any of its employees, officers or directors has been used or designated as an expert witness or consultant for the Oles Morrison Rinker & Baker law firm, by that or any other name, or any of its clients, and state the name and nature of each of those representations including client and court case name and court case number if any.

### ANSWER:

Defendant Nugget incorporates herein its General Objections In addition, Nugget objects to above. calls attorney-client privileged it for Interrogatory, as information, and is duplicative, as Plaintiff has made this inquiry during its multiple 30(b)(6) depositions of Nugget. Without waiving any of its objections, Nugget refers Plaintiff to the deposition testimony for the response to this inquiry.

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Describe in full detail each factual basis which supports, or tends to support, the allegations in each of the affirmative defenses stated in your

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO-DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) 45-40/#82043 Page 10 of 17 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Answer and Affirmative Defenses dated September 21, 2005 to

North Star's Amended Complaint.

## ANSWER:

Defendant Nugget incorporates herein its General Objections stated above. In addition, Nugget objects to this interrogatory as it is duplicative given the extensive deposition testimony taken in this matter that covers many of the inquiries made herein.

Affirmative Defense No. 1: Plaintiff asks Nugget to provide the facts constituting the absence of a contract between itself and Plaintiff; i.e. it seeks to have Nugget prove a negative. To do so, Nugget refers Plaintiff to the totality of the discovery taken in this case, including the depositions of Nugget's and Plaintiff's personnel. From that discovery, it is evident that there was never a "meeting of the minds" between the parties required to form a contractual relationship.

Affirmative Defense No. 2: The fact that Plaintiff was a second-tier supplier to a material supplier was decided in the 9<sup>th</sup> Circuit decision dated September 27, 2001.

Affirmative Defense No. 3: With regard to Nugget and not USF&G, this Affirmative Defense is withdrawn.

Affirmative Defense No. 4: This Affirmative Defense presents a legal question under the Miller Act. To the extent Plaintiff's claims are not covered under the Act and the cases interpreting it, they are not recoverable under the Miller Act cause of action set forth in Plaintiff's complaint (e.g. tort claims, punitive damages, attorneys' fees, etc.).

Affirmative Defense No. 5: With regard to Nugget and not USF&G, this Affirmative Defense is withdrawn.

Affirmative Defense No. 6: With regard to Nugget and not USF&G, the Affirmative Defense relating to "unclean hands" is withdrawn. As to the Defense of laches, Plaintiff's waited seven years from the time the events on the project occurred before it amended its complaint to incorporate numerous causes of action that had not been previously brought. The statute of limitations had long ago run on these claims and it is now

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 11 of 17 45-40/#82043

P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit <u>4</u>
\_//\_ of \_/7

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

25

difficult to reconstruct all of the events surrounding project.

Affirmative Defense No. 7: With regard to Nugget and not USF&G, this Affirmative Defense is withdrawn.

Affirmative Defense No. 8: Plaintiff's personnel have testified that it was its policy to invoice on a weekly basis for work performed and that 30 days later it would expect payment. this project, Plaintiff continued to work in spite of the fact that it did not receive timely payment from Spencer Rock Products for the work Plaintiff had performed. By continuing to provide Spencer Rock Products services in the face of nonpayment, Plaintiff failed to mitigate its damages. In addition. Plaintiff did not inform Nugget timely of Spencer Rock Product's failure to make timely payment. Once it did so and Nugget responsible Plaintiff Nugget was not informed that Plaintiff ceased performing Plaintiff's payments, incurring additional expenses.

See response to Affirmative Defense Affirmative Defense No. 9: No. 8. In addition, Plaintiff's contract was with Spencer Rock To the extent Plaintiff was owed money and not paid, the responsibility for that lays with Spencer Rock Products. This is especially true with regard to the first two barges of material loaded by Plaintiff, as Spencer Rock Products had been paid as provided for in the contract by Nugget for that effort.

Affirmative Defense No. 10: With regard to Nugget USF&G, this Affirmative Defense is withdrawn.

See response to Affirmative Defense Affirmative Defense No. 11: No. 8.

Affirmative Defense No. 12: This Affirmative Defense is behalf of USF&G, and therefore, this Interrogatory must addressed to it.

See response to Affirmative Defense Affirmative Defense No. 13: No. 12.

To the extent Plaintiff's claims Affirmative Defense No. 14: arise in contract, punitive damages are legally barred.

Affirmative Defense No. 15: See response to Affirmative Defense No. 8.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 12 of 17 45-40/#82043 P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit

25

1

Plaintiff's contract was with Affirmative Defense No. 16: Spencer Rock Products, not Nugget. As such, Spencer Products is responsible for making payment to Plaintiff for any Spencer Rock Products was paid \$147,000 by work performed. Nugget for the first two loads of rock, which funds Spencer Rock Product refused to use to pay its suppliers. To avoid having to pay its suppliers, Spencer Rock Products intentionally mislead those suppliers by telling them that it had received no money Spencer Rock Products also failed to inform its from Nugget. suppliers that its entitlement to further payment from Nugget would likely be reduced because of Spencer Rock Product's inability to produce the required rock for the project and the necessity of Nugget supplementing Spencer Rock Product's work force and equipment. Any harm caused to Plaintiff on this project was the result of Spencer Rock Product's duplicity in dealing with both Plaintiff and Nugget.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Completely describe the subject and contents of the information relevant to this case held by each person listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

# ANSWER:

Nugget incorporates herein its General Objections Defendant Nugget also objects to this Interrogatory as stated above. overbroad, unduly burdensome, cumulative, duplicative, seeking attorney-client information, the information can be obtained from a source that is more convenient and less expensive, and Plaintiff has had ample opportunity over the last eight years to obtain the information sought. Nugget has previously provided witness disclosures describing the information relating to this case possessed by each witness. Subsequently, Plaintiff has taken the deposition of the key witnesses listed on Nugget's information know to For the witness list. witnesses, Nugget refers Plaintiff to the deposition transcripts for those witnesses. As to those individuals who work for Plaintiffs that Nugget included in its final witness list, Plaintiffs certainly have a better ability to ascertain what those individuals know about the events surrounding this case

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY
REQUESTS TO-DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 13 of 17
P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit <u>4</u> 13 of 17

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

than Nugget does. Further, much of the information relating to this matter is contained in the documents produced by all parties in this litigation.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: Specifically state the subject matter and content of the anticipated testimony of each witness listed on your final witness list due February 14, 2006, herein.

# ANSWER:

incorporates herein its General Objections Defendant Nugget In addition, this Interrogatory seeks attorneystated above. The information as to client information and work product. which each witness will testify regarding is a decision made by counsel based in his/her mental impressions of the subject matter and the legal strategies involved in trying the case. such, they are not subject to discovery. Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 26 In addition, as Defendant in this matter, Nugget's (b)(3). case-in-chief will be dictated in some degree by what Plaintiffs put forth in their case and by what issues remain after dispositive motions and motions in limine are ruled upon, which means the expected testimony of Nugget's witnesses is not yet fully ascertainable.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: Produce any and all unprivileged documents reflecting or otherwise relating to the information requested by Interrogatory Nos. 6 through 16 propounded above.

#### ANSWER:

Defendant Nugget incorporates herein its General Objections stated above. Without waiving its objections, Nugget has previously produced all relevant, non-privileged documents to Plaintiffs. Thus, Nugget objects to this Request as being duplicative and unduly burdensome.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY
REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction,
et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)
Page 14 of 17

P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit <u>4</u>
/ of /7

Ву

BURR, PEASE & KURTZ

Attorneys for North Star

Michael W. Sewright Alaska Bar # 7510090

DATED: March 20, 2006.

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 15 of 17

45-40/#82043

P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP 745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136 Tel: (907) 258-0106 Fax: (907) 258-5519 

20

21

24

25

ij

OLES MORRISON RINKER & BAKER LLP
745 West Fourth Avenue, Suite 502 Anchorage, Alaska 99501-2136 (907) 258-0106 Fax: (907) 258-5519 1

2

#### ATTORNEY VERIFICATION

In accordance with Rule 33 (b) (2), I hereby verify that the requested discovery the foregoing objections to consistent with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and warranted by existing law or a good faith argument for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

> Phomas R. Krider, Pro Hac Vice Attorney for Defendant Nugget Construction, Inc.

## OATH

Nugget Construction, Inc., does hereby swear, under oath, that the foregoing answers to discovery requests are true to the best of its knowledge and belief.

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me this ZO day of

March, 2006. NOTARY PUBLIC FOR My commission expires:

My Commission Expires November 5, 2009

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC. United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH) Page 16 of 17 45-40/#82043

Exhibit

CERTIFI	CATE	OF	SERVICE

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

I certify that on the 20th day of March 2006, a copy of the foregoing was served by U.S. Mail on:

Michael W. Sewright BURR PEASE & KURTZ 810 "N" Street Anchorage, AK 99501

Steven J. Shamburek, Esq. 425 G Street, Suite 630 Anchorage, AK 99501-5872

C. Patrick Stoll, Esq. HERRIG VOGT & STOLL LLP 4210 Douglas Blvd., Ste. 100 Granite Bay, CA 95746-5902

Paul D. Stockler, Esq. 1309 W. 16th Ave Anchorage, AK 99501

Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq. Barokas Martin & Tomlinson 1029 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave., Suite 280 Anchorage, AK 99501

Catherine A. Melland

NUGGET'S RESPONSES TO NORTH STAR'S SECOND SET OF DISCOVERY REQUESTS TO DEFENDANT NUGGET CONSTRUCTION, INC.

United States ex rel. North Star, et al. v. Nugget Construction, et al., A98-009 CIV (HRH)

Page 17 of 17 45-40/#82043

P-TRK Responses to North Star's Second Discovery Requests 032006 993100002.doc

Exhibit <u>4</u> /7 of /7

SHAMBUREK LAW OFFICE, LLC DBA LAW OFFICE OF

STEVEN J. SHAMBUREK

SUITE 630 425 G STREET DOCKETED

- <del>ay</del>

DIRECT: (907) 522-5339 CELL PHONE: (907) 250-0044 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

FACSIMILE: (907) 522-5393

shamburek@gci.net www.shamburek.com

RECEIVED

APR 0 6 2006

April 4, 2006

Mr. Herbert A. Viergutz, Esq. Barokas Martin & Tomlinson 1029 W. 3rd Avenue, Suite 280 Anchorage, Alaska 99501

BUBB, PEASE & KURTZ

Dear Herb:

North Star's recent discovery requests ask USF&G at Interrogatory Number 10 to "[d]escribe in full detail each factual basis which supports, or tends to support, the allegations in each of the affirmative defenses stated in your Answer and Affirmative Defenses dated September 21, 2005 to North Star's Amended Complaint." In its response dated March 14, 2006, USF&G does not state any factual basis to support any of its affirmative defenses. USF&G does not provide a factual basis to challenge the claims of bad faith maintained by the claimants or to support the statute of limitations defense advanced by USF&G. Therefore, the claimants and court can conclude that USF&G by its own responses admits that there is no factual basis underpinning its defenses.

The reference to a statute of limitations defense in your discovery responses is also unsupported by the record. When the three complaints were first filed in 1998, the claimants did not know how USF&G had handled and mishandled their claims. USF&G's treatment and mistreatment of the claims did not emerge until recently. Many of the documents were first disclosed last November, 2005. USF&G did not waive its asserted privilege and produce other documents and correspondence until January, 2006. The acts of bad faith continue to this day. The statute of limitations for torts is two years; the statute will not expire until the breaches cease.

The expert report of William Grant Callow, produced to the defendants on February 14, 2006, discusses the legal import of USF&G's activity and inactivity. The recent decision of the Ninth Circuit finds in pertinent part that there is evidence of subterfuge. Thus, USF&G has known since March, 2005 that there is evidence of subterfuge by Nugget and yet it has not fulfilled its duties. When USF&G should have investigated and seriously considered paying the claims, its records indicate that it breached and disregarded its duties. The actions and inactions

Exhibit <u>5</u>
\_/ of <u>4</u>

continue to this day and are more egregious because USF&G now has more knowledge of Nugget's activities and misrepresentations to it. USF&G's recent statements and actions ratify and reaffirm its bad faith.

The court in <u>Alvarez v. Insurance Co. of North America</u>, 667 F.Supp. 689, 696 (N.D. Cal. 1987) anticipates the seminal Ninth Circuit decision in <u>K-W Industries</u> issued in 1988. The decision notes the applicability of 31 C.F.R. Section 223.18, among other provisions. <u>Id.</u> The regulation states in pertinent part: "Every company shall promptly honor its bonds naming the United States or one of its agencies or instrumentalities as obligee." This and other regulations establish the duties.

Nugget and USF&G have done little to resolve the case other than make a total offer of \$35,000.00 to the three claimants for the first time in June, 2005. The offer is a benchmark of bad faith, because the sum is a little more that merely the prejudgment interest on Metco's claim alone. USF&G's recent offer to settle with all three claimants for one dollar (\$1.00) in light of the findings and record to date is another act of bad faith. USF&G is on the retrograde.

The District Court found that Mr. Randolph, the signatory on both the "Material Agreement" and "Support Agreement" on behalf of Nugget, was involved with Nugget, Spencer and Trecon. The District Court found:

Other significant undisputed facts in the record show that Nugget was ideally situated to take over operations at the Spencer quarry. For five years preceding his position as Nugget's project manager, Lynn D. Randolph worked as the project manager and job estimator in the Spencer quarry under its previous owner, Trecon (for whom Nugget's general manager and corporate secretary Greg Poyner also worked as a Randolph also worked as senior general manager). engineer, bid estimator, and project manager for Spencer after Robert LaPore purchased the quarry in In fact, prior to the Homer Spit project, Randolph worked for Nugget as a consultant, bid estimator, and project manager at the same time he worked for LaPore at Spencer. According to Randolph and LaPore, most of the calculations resulting in Spencer's pricing to Nugget on the Homer Spit bid were prepared by Randolph as a bid estimator and consultant for Spencer (while he also worked as a project manager for Nugget).

(Excerpts of Record p. 334 at l. 11 - 335, l. 6 in the second appeal to the Ninth Circuit). A copy of a business card stating that Mr. Randolph works for Spencer, another one stating that he works for Nugget, and another one stating that he works for LDR have been produced in this litigation. None of the cards state any periods of employment and/or limitation on his engagement on them.

At his recent deposition, Mr. Randolph testified that for many years he has agreed to assist contractors asserting a claim or legal issue on a project only if they agree to use one of three or four attorneys he specifies. He testified that his first choice is the Oles, Morrison law firm and that he steered Nugget Construction to the law firm in 1996 to handle the bid protest related to the Homer Project. The law firm has continued to represent Nugget, and then USF&G, in this litigation. He also stated that he steers clients to you. You and your law firm entered its appearance for USF&G to defend the bad faith claims asserted against USF&G. This development is of great concern. Has USF&G obtained the independent evaluation it owes the three claimants under the payment bond and applicable laws and regulations? Do your and your firm's connections with Mr. Randolph, who is at the center of the controversy and conspiracy, taint any neutral evaluation you can provide? Is USF&G aware of that relationship and apparent conflict? Will it become aware of the them for the first time at trial or through this letter?

The USF&G files include statements by Mr. James Ferguson, USF&G's and Nugget's agent and broker, that USF&G will let Nugget take care of things. One facsimile cover sheet dated September 2, 1997 signed by Mr. Ferguson states that Spencer Rock is a "Vender" not a "Sub." That conclusion is contradicted by the applicable Supreme Court decisions in MacEvoy (1944) and F.D. Rich (1974) on the facts in this case. These two cases are discussed in the files recently produced by USF&G. (USF&G 001640 - 001646). The claimants discussed and the District Judge relied on these two Supreme Court decisions. Oles, Morrison and USF&G advanced a Ninth Circuit case, Aetna Casualty (1992), on appeal and was fortunate to draw the author of that decision, Judge T.G. Nelson, on the panel that addressed the matter. The other two members of the panel deferred to his prior decision rather than Supreme Court authority. At times in the practice of law, personal deference does trump stare decisis. The Supreme Court However, the Supreme Court very likely would have reversed. rarely accepts a petition for certiorari in a Miller Act case so that option was expensive and extremely tenuous.

USF&G has ignored another basis for liability that the claims by the claimants arise from a direct contractual relationship with Nugget. Shoreside received the same signed Credit Application from Nugget that it received from Spencer Rock Products. The District Court previously found that the Shoreside Credit Application created a direct contractual relationship and provided a contractual basis for an award of attorney's fees. Shoreside had done work for Nugget prior to April, 1997 and subsequent to the termination of work billed initially to Spencer Rock Products during the summer of 1997. This issue was briefed to but not addressed by the District Court in 1999. North Star also claims a direct contractual relationship with Nugget which was discussed in recent depositions.

Mr. Ferguson expressed surprise at his deposition on March 8 with the allegations in North Star's Amended Complaint filed last

Exhibit <u>5</u>
3 of 4

year. He stated that he was not aware of the allegations until the previous weekend. He had not investigated the allegations at the time but suggested that he would review them. He was provided copies, through counsel, of the Shoreside and Metco Amended Complaints on March 9. Mr. Ferguson was asked about the detailed letter from Mr. J. Dennis Stacey with Chugach Rock Corporation to Ms. Jane Bennett Poling with USF&G dated March 18, 1998 that explicated Nugget's fraudulent conduct and efforts to take over the Spencer Quarry. USF&G was aware of the fraud and subterfuge and still refused to undertake or fulfill its duties.

Claimants already proved their contract-based damages and were awarded judgment for those damages by the court in 1999. In reaching this conclusion, the District Court also found that the goods were provided and the services performed for the use and benefit of the Homer Project. These findings and others were not challenged on appeal. Any challenge has been waived. Kesselring v. F/T Arctic Hero, 95 F.3d 23, 24-25 (9th Cir. 1996). On this basis, USF&G should have paid the three claims with some interest at a minimum back in 1999 if not earlier.

You threaten to bring a motion for attorney's fees. The claimants can also bring a motion for attorney's fees. Your statements in letters and discovery responses appear to be written for client consumption. The "macho man" stuff may not play well in Federal Court which requires more decorum and propriety.

If you have any questions or a serious desire to resolve this matter on behalf of your client, please contact me or Mr. Sewright. Thank you for your attention to this matter. Best wishes.

THE LAW OFFICE OF STEVEN J. SHAMBUREK

By: Steven J. Shamburek

Steven J. Shamburek

CC: Michael W. Sewright, Esq. Thomas R. Krider, Esq.

Douglas R. Davis, Esq.

RESIDENT COUNSEL, ALASKA OFFICE

HERBERT A. VIERGUTZ

# BAROKAS MARTIN & TOMLINSON

LARRY L. BAROKAS, P.S. DALE R. MARTIN, P.S. JOHN R. TOMLINSON, JR. FRANKLIN L. DENNIS MICHAEL A. GALLETCH LAURA KLEISLE GREGORY FULLERTON 1029 West Third, Suite 280 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501 (907) 276-8010 FAX (907) 276-5334

BARMAR @ GCI.NET

April 10, 2006

Via Facsimile No. 277-9883

Steven J. Shamburek, Esq. Law Office of Steven J. Shamburek 425 G Street, Suite 630 Anchorage, AK 99501-5872

Re: North Star v. Nugget Construction, et.al.

Dear Mr. Shamburek:

Your letter dated April 4, 2006, strikes me as one that could well have been drafted for presentation in a film with its subject being paranoia. Your letter is unworthy of a response but will be addressed under the Court Order through the filing of appropriate Motion practice.

Sincerely.

Herbert A. Viergutz

HAV/sbj

SEATTLE OFFICE: 1422 BELLEVUE AVENUE, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98122, (206) 821-1871. FAX (206) 621-9907 Exhibit

\_/\_ of \_ /

Subject: Noncompliance

From: "Michael W. Sewright" <mws@bpk.com>

Date: Thu, 27 Apr 2006 13:08:08 -0800

To: Herbert Viergutz <barmar@gci.net>, Tom Krider < Krider@OLES.com>

CC: Steve Shamburek <shamburek@gci.net>

With the deadline for motions looming, I am wondering if your clients will be providing complete responsive disclosures to my client's second set of discovery requests propounded on February 14, 2006, as required by Federal Civil Rules 26 and Please let me know and provide the disclosures before the deadline grows much closer. Among other things, I am concerned about Nugget's failure to give sufficient factual bases for several of the affirmative defenses it is still making and, even more, USF&G's failure to provide any factual basis for defenses. only response on that point was dated March 16 and received March 17 from Mr. Viergutz. That response chiefly referenced a forthcoming Response to a similar discovery request propounded to Nugget, through the Oles Morrison law firm which also represents USF&G. In Mr. Viergutz's response USF&G also simply denied it committed bad faith and alleged that the "Statute of Limitations" expired on the claims asserted "by Plaintiff against Defendant" before the Amended Complaint. Nugget's eventual Response through Oles Morrison, which was expressly made only on behalf of Nugget and dated March 20 and received March 22, did not state any factual basis for any defense asserted as to USF&G. Therefore, we are left with no factual bases beiing provided.

Please consider this our meet and confer under the federal rules on this matter, if I do not hear from you as requested.

Thank you.

M. Sewright

Michael W. Sewright Burr, Pease & Kurtz 810 N Street, Anchorage AK 99501 (907) 276-6100 http://www.bpk.com

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This transmission (including all attachments) is intended only for the use of the named addressee(s), and may contain information that is privileged or exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the named addressee(s), you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, distribution or copying of this transmission is STRICTLY PROHIBITED. If you have received this transmission in error, please destroy it and notify us immediately at (800) 474-4275 or (907) 276-6100.

\*

Exhibit \_\_\_\_\_/\_ of \_\_\_\_/\_